BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of: Tachibana et al.	:	Before the Examiner: Augustine, Nicholas
Serial No.: 10/674,180	:	Group Art Unit: 2179
Filing Date: September 29, 2003	:	
Title: DIVIDING A LARGE INPUT PAGE INTO A PLURALITY OF SMALLER INPUT PAGES TO PROVIDE EASIER USE OF A TERMINAL WITH A SMALL SCREEN	:	IBM Corporation Dept. T81/Bldg. 503 P.O. Box 12195 3039 Cornwallis Road Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation, which is the assignee of the entire right, title and interest in the above-identified patent application.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 3-14 stand rejected. Claim 2 was cancelled. Claims 1 and 3-14 are appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Appellants submitted an amendment (October 11, 2007) following receipt of the final office action (July 17, 2007) where the amendment corrected a typographical mistake in claim 13.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent Claim 1:

An information terminal which displays input pages downloaded from a server via a network, and which transmits, using the network, information entered into the input pages by a user, the information terminal comprises a page display section for displaying a plurality of input pages using a browser executed by the information terminal. Specification, page 3, paragraph [0012], lines 3-4; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 3-6; Specification, page 6, paragraph [0025], lines 1-4; Figure 1, elements 20, 25, 30, 420. The information terminal further comprises an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0026], lines 1-2; Figure 1, element 430. Further, the information terminal comprises an input information transmission section for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0029]; lines 1-3; Figure 1, element 440. Furthermore, the information transmission comprises a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, where the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further where the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server. Specification, page 5, paragraph [0023], lines 1-4; Specification, page 7, paragraph [0029], lines 3-5; Specification, page 9, paragraph [0037], lines 1-2; Figure 4, element 400.

Independent Claim 10:

A transmission-reception proxy apparatus for displaying input pages downloaded from a server to an information terminal via a network, and for transmitting information entered into the input pages by a user, the proxy apparatus comprises a page display section for displaying a plurality of input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal. Specification, page 3, paragraph [0012], lines 3-4; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 3-6; Specification, page 5, paragraph [0020], lines 1-4; Specification, page 6, paragraph [0025], lines 1-4; Figure 1, elements 20, 25, 30, 40, 420. The proxy apparatus further comprises an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0026], lines 1-2; Figure 1, element 430. Further, the proxy apparatus comprises an input information transmission section for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction to transmit the plurality of input parameters. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0029]; lines 1-3; Figure 1, element 440. Further, the proxy apparatus comprises a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, where the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further where the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server. Specification, page 5, paragraph [0023], lines 1-4; Specification, page 7, paragraph [0029], lines 3-5; Specification, page 9, paragraph [0037], lines 1-2; Figure 4, element 400.

Independent Claim 11:

A communication system comprising a server for storing a plurality of input pages and an information terminal for accepting a user's entries into the input pages, where the server comprises a page transmission section for transmitting the input pages in response to an instruction from the information terminal, the information

terminal comprises a page reception section for transmitting the instruction from the information terminal and for receiving the input pages. Specification, page 3, paragraph [0012], lines 1-5; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0015], lines 1-3; Specification, page 5, paragraph [0023], lines 1-6; Specification, page 9, paragraph [0037], lines 1-2; Figure 1, elements 10, 20, 30, 110; Figure 4, element 400. Further, the information terminal comprises a page display section for displaying the input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0025], lines 1-3; Figure 4, element 420. Additionally, the information terminal comprises an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0026], lines 1-2; Figure 1, element 430. Furthermore, the information terminal comprises an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0029]; lines 1-5; Figure 1, element 440. Further, the information terminal comprises a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, where the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further where the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server. Specification, page 5, paragraph [0023], lines 1-4; Specification, page 7, paragraph [0029], lines 3-5; Specification, page 9, paragraph [0037], lines 1-2; Figure 4, element 400.

Independent Claim 12:

A method of communication between a server which stores a plurality of input pages and an information terminal which accepts a user's input entered using more than one of the input pages, comprising the step of transmitting a plurality of input pages from a server to an information terminal in response to a request from the information terminal. Specification, pages 13-14, paragraph [0055], lines 1-7; Figure 4, step 400. The method further comprises receiving the input pages by the

information terminal. Specification, page 14, paragraph [0055], lines 7-10; Figure 4, step 410. Further, the method comprises displaying the input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal. Specification, page 14, paragraph [0057], lines 2-4; Figure 4, step 420. Additionally, the method comprises storing, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages. Specification, page 14, paragraph [0057], lines 4-11; Figure 4, step 430. Further, the method comprises combining the stored input parameters according to package identification information. Specification, page 16, paragraph [0062], lines 1-3; Figure 5, step 510. Furthermore, the method comprises transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction. Specification, page 16, paragraph [0062], lines 1-3; Figure 5, step 510.

Independent Claim 13:

A program product enabling a computer to function as an information terminal which displays input pages downloaded from a server via a network and transmits information entered into the input pages by a user, the program product providing modules of computer usable program code tangibly embodied in a computer usable storage medium, the modules comprising a page display module for displaying input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal. Specification, page 3, paragraph [0012], lines 3-4; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 3-6; Specification, page 6, paragraph [0025], lines 1-4; Specification, page 18, paragraph [0071], lines 1-5; Specification, page 18, paragraph [0072], lines 1-2; Figure 1, elements 20, 25, 30, 420. The modules further comprise an input information storage module for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0026], lines 1-2; Figure 1, element 430. Further, the modules comprise an input information transmission module for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to receiving an instruction. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0029]; lines 1-3; Figure 1, element 440. Additionally, the modules

comprise a page reception module for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, where the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further where the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server. Specification, page 5, paragraph [0023], lines 1-4; Specification, page 7, paragraph [0029], lines 3-5; Specification, page 9, paragraph [0037], lines 1-2; Figure 4, element 400.

Independent Claim 14:

A computer usable recording medium that tangibly embodies modules of computer usable program instructions enabling a computer to function as an information terminal for displaying input pages downloaded from a server via a network and for transmitting, using the network, information entered by a user into more than one of the input pages, the recording medium comprises a page display module for displaying a plurality of input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal. Specification, page 3, paragraph [0012], lines 3-4; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; Specification, page 3, paragraph [0013], lines 3-6; Specification, page 6, paragraph [0025], lines 1-4; Specification, page 18, paragraph [0071], lines 1-5; Specification, page 18, paragraph [0072], lines 1-2; Figure 1, elements 20, 25, 30, 420. Further, the recording medium comprises an input information storage module for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0026], lines 1-2; Figure 1, element 430. Additionally, the recording medium comprises an input information transmission module for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction to transmit the plurality of input parameters. Specification, page 6, paragraph [0029]; lines 1-3; Figure 1, element 440. Furthermore, the recording medium comprises a page reception module for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, where the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further where

the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server. Specification, page 5, paragraph [0023], lines 1-4; Specification, page 7, paragraph [0029], lines 3-5; Specification, page 9, paragraph [0037], lines 1-2; Figure 4, element 400.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. Claims 1 and 3-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iida (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032739) in view of Hopson et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0068443) (hereinafter "Hopson").

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Claims 1 and 3-14 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

1. Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach at least the following claim limitations.

a. Claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 10, 11, 13 and 14. The Examiner cites element 24 of Hopson as teaching the claimed input information storage section and further cites paragraphs [0029, 0031, 0032, 0046, 0049, 0057, 0058 and 0061] of Hopson as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 4-5. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Hopson teaches that the online shopping system 20 includes a central server 22 that contains the various databases fundamental to the operation of the ordering system, for example, an order database 24, a registration database 26, a map database

28 and an employee database 30. [0029]. Hopson further teaches that the order database 24 contains various tables that are utilized to store data relating to items available for sale, customers, customer orders, delivery addresses, etc. [0029]. In addition, Hopson teaches that if the customer chooses to start a new order at 204, the customer is then presented a screen in which the service type and order type are to be selected. [0049]. Additionally, Hopson teaches that order type options include a grocery order, an event planning or catering order, a flower order, a liquor order, etc. [0049]. Furthermore, Hopson teaches that the service options include delivery service, pick up service, print a shopping list service, etc. [0049]. Hopson further teaches that if the customer selects a delivery service at 222, a screen is presented, at 224, requesting that a delivery address be entered; and the server 22 utilizes, at 226, the map database 28 to validate that delivery address for purposes of creating a delivery route. [0049]. Hopson additionally teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents, at 230 of FIG. 3B, a shopping screen to the customer. [0057]. Furthermore, Hopson teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option, at 242, is then selected; and the system provides a display, at 246, of the contents of the shopping cart. [0058]. In addition, Hopson teaches that the submitted order is stored in the order database 24 of the server 22. [0061].

Hence, Hopson teaches a server 22 that includes an order database 24 that stores data relating to items available for sale, customers, customer orders, delivery addresses, etc.

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches an information terminal which displays input pages downloaded from a server via a network...,said information terminal comprising: an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters. Instead, Hopson teaches a **server** 22 with an order database 24 for storing data related to an order. The above-cited claim limitation is not directed to a storage section within a server.

Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches an information terminal comprising an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Appellants further assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "an input information transmission section for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 10, 13 and 14. The Examiner cites paragraph [0046], lines 1-5 of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 4. The Examiner further cites paragraphs [0046, 0049, 0057, 0058 and 0061] of Hopson as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 4-5. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Iida teaches that when all of the text data entered into the text input boxes are read out and output to the gateway server 7 and all of the text input boxes become empty (step T8), the gateway server 7 arranges the text data that have been sequentially read out from the text input boxes in order of time of input, and outputs a series of all arranged main text data of e-mail to the POP server 8 (step T9). [0046].

Hence, Iida teaches sending text data of an e-mail entered by the user to gateway server 7.

There is no language in the cited passage of Iida that teaches transmitting the plurality of input parameters. Neither is there any language in the cited passage of Iida that teaches transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction.

Furthermore, as stated above, Hopson teaches that if the customer chooses to start a new order at 204, the customer is then presented a screen in which the service

type and order type are to be selected. [0049]. Additionally, Hopson teaches that order type options include a grocery order, an event planning or catering order, a flower order, a liquor order, etc. [0049]. Furthermore, Hopson teaches that the service options include delivery service, pick up service, print a shopping list service, etc. [0049]. Hopson further teaches that if the customer selects a delivery service at 222, a screen is presented, at 224, requesting that a delivery address be entered; and the server 22 utilizes, at 226, the map database 28 to validate that delivery address for purposes of creating a delivery route. [0049]. Hopson additionally teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents, at 230 of FIG. 3B, a shopping screen to the customer. [0057]. Furthermore, Hopson teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option, at 242, is then selected; and the system provides a display, at 246, of the contents of the shopping cart. [0058]. In addition, Hopson teaches that the submitted order is stored in the order database 24 of the server 22. [0061].

Hence, Hopson teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents a shopping screen to the customer. Hopson further teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option is then selected, and the system provides a display of the contents of the shopping cart.

There is no language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches an information terminal which displays input pages downloaded from a server via a network...,said information terminal comprising: an input information transmission section for transmitting the plurality of input parameters. Instead, Hopson teaches a **server** 22 that presents a shopping screen to the customer as well as displays the contents of the shopping cart after the customer has selected all of the items for an order. The above-cited claim limitation is not directed to an information transmission section within a server.

Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches an information terminal comprising an input information transmission section for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1, 10, 13 and 14, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Appellants further assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction" as recited in claim 11. The Examiner further cites paragraphs [0046, 0049, 0057, 0058 and 0061] of Hopson as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 4-5. Appellants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Hopson teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents a shopping screen to the customer. Hopson further teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option is then selected, and the system provides a display of the contents of the shopping cart.

There is no language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches a communication system comprising a server...said information terminal comprising: an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters. Instead, Hopson teaches a **server** 22 that presents a shopping screen to the customer as well as displays the contents of the shopping cart after the customer has selected all of the items for an order. The above-cited claim limitation is not directed to an information transmission section within a server.

Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches an information terminal comprising an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction. The Examiner has not specifically pointed to any language in Hopson

that is directed to combining input parameters. If the Examiner is asserting that the information provided by the user to order an item/service corresponds to the claimed input parameters, then the Examiner has to show that Hopson teaches that the information terminal includes an input information transmission section for combining such input parameters and that such combined input parameters are transmitted in response to an instruction. The Examiner has failed to provide such a finding.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 11, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Appellants further assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, wherein the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 10, 11, 13 and 14. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0030 and 0035] of Iida as teaching the aspect of a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, where the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 4. The Examiner further cites paragraphs [0031, 0032, 0038, 0040, 0046, 0047, 0049, 0057, 0058, 0061] of Hopson as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. *Id.* at pages 4-5. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Iida teaches that Figure 1 shows an example of a system configuration used in a case where a portable terminal adaptable to Compact HTML (Hyper Text Markup Language) accesses via a gateway server to a POP (Post Office Protocol) server or the like that requires user authentication. [0030]. Iida further teaches that in response to

a user's operation, the portable terminal 1 displays a screen of a received e-mail list (not shown) on the display 2. [0035]. Iida further teaches that then, a desirable e-mail is selected from the received e-mail list on the screen. [0035]. Additionally, Iida teaches that in response to the selection, a request for receiving (reading out) the desirable e-mail is output from the portable terminal 1 to the POP server 8 (step S1). [0035].

Hence, Iida teaches that a portable terminal displays a received e-mail list. After the user of the portable terminal selects an e-mail from the e-mail list, a request for receiving (reading out) the selected e-mail is output from the portable terminal to the Post Office Protocol server.

There is no language in the cited passages of Iida that teaches a page reception section for receiving the input pages. Instead, Iida teaches receiving an e-mail list. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information. Neither is there any language in the cited passages of Iida that teaches that the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters.

Furthermore, as stated above, Hopson teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents a shopping screen to the customer. Hopson further teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option is then selected, and the system provides a display of the contents of the shopping cart.

There is no language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches an information terminal which displays input pages downloaded from a server via a network...,said information terminal comprising: a page reception section for receiving the input pages. Instead, Hopson teaches a **server** 22 with an order database 24 for storing data related to an order. The above-cited claim limitation is not directed to a reception section within a server.

Furthermore, the Examiner had previously cited to order database 24 of Hopson as allegedly teaching the claimed input information storage section. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 4. The Examiner also appears to cite order database 24 of Hopson as allegedly teaching the claimed page reception section. *Id.* at pages 4-5. Appellants respectfully assert that these sections are separately claimed elements and that the Examiner must explain how order database 24 of Hopson can correspond to both the claimed input information storage section and the claimed page reception section.

Additionally, there is no language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches an information terminal comprising: a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information. Neither is there any language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches an information terminal comprising: a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, where the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters. Neither is there any language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches an information terminal comprising: an input information transmission section that combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package. Neither is there any language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches an information terminal comprising: an input information transmission section that combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

b. Claims 3-9 are patentable over Iida in view of Hopson for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Claims 3-9 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 1, and hence claims 3-9 are patentable over Iida in view of Hopson for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

c. Claim 3 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "wherein the input information storage section associates input identification information for identifying input information of a package with the input parameters, and wherein the input information transmission section selects and combines input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and which are associated with the same input identification information from among the input parameters stored in the input information storage section, and transmits the resulting combination as the input information" as recited in claim 3. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0046 and 0056] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/25/2010), pages 5-6; Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 6-7. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Iida teaches that when all of the text data entered into the text input boxes are read out and output to the gateway server 7 and all of the text input boxes become empty (step T8), the gateway server 7 arranges the text data that have been sequentially read out from the text input boxes in order of time of input, and outputs a series of all arranged main text data of e-mail to the POP server 8 (step T9). [0046]. Iida further teaches that the POP server 8 performs a transmission of the e-mail as an SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) server. [0046]. Furthermore, Iida teaches that according to the transmitting/receiving method of the text data in the portable terminal, main text data received from a predetermined server are divided into a plurality of segment text data each having a data size displayable on the portable terminal and output to the portable terminal by a gateway server. [0056].

Hence, Iida teaches dividing long text data into a plurality of segment data each having a data size displayable on the portable terminal. Further, Iida teaches

allowing a user to enter text data in an e-mail up to the limit of the number of characters that are transmittable from the portable terminal.

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches an input information storage section that associates input identification information for identifying input information of a package with the input parameters. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches an input information transmission section that selects and combines input parameters entered into the input pages of a package. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches an input information transmission section that selects and combines input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and which are associated with the same input identification information from among the input parameters stored in the input information storage section. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches transmitting the resulting combination as the input information.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 3, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

d. Claim 4 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters and transmits the combination after all of the input parameters of a package have been stored in the input information storage section" as recited in claim 4. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0046 and 0056] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 6; Office Action (1/5/2011), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Iida teaches dividing long text data into a plurality of segment data each having a data size displayable on the portable terminal. Further, Iida teaches allowing a user to enter text data in an e-mail up to the limit of the number of characters that are transmittable from the portable terminal.

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches an input information transmission section that combines the input parameters and transmits the combination after all of the input parameters of a package have been stored in the input information storage section.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 4, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

e. Claim 5 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "further comprising a page storage section for storing the input pages and associating the plurality of input pages with package identification information; wherein the page reception section receives the input pages and associates the input pages with information for identifying a display order; and further wherein the page display section displays a selected input page stored in the page storage section, and then, responsive to receiving an indication that entry of input into the selected input page is complete, displays the input page that is next according to the display order" as recited in claim 5. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0046 and 0056] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 6; Office Action (1/5/2011), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Iida teaches dividing long text data into a plurality of segment data each having a data size displayable on the portable terminal. Further, Iida teaches allowing a user to enter text data in an e-mail up to the limit of the number of characters that are transmittable from the portable terminal.

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches a page storage section for storing the input pages and associating the plurality of input pages with package identification information. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches a page reception section that receives the input pages and associates the input

pages with information for identifying a display order. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches a page display section that displays a selected input page stored in the page storage section. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches a page display section that displays a selected input page stored in the page storage section and then, responsive to receiving an indication that entry of input into the selected input page is complete, displays the input page that is next according to the display order.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 5, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

f. Claim 6 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "wherein the page reception section receives destination information for identifying a return destination of the input information, associates the destination information with package identification information; and the input information transmission section selects and combines a plurality of input parameters of a package from the information storage section, and transmits the resulting combination to the return destination identified by the destination information associated with the package" as recited in claim 6. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0046 and 0056] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 7; Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 9-8. Appellants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Iida teaches dividing long text data into a plurality of segment data each having a data size displayable on the portable terminal. Further, Iida teaches allowing a user to enter text data in an e-mail up to the limit of the number of characters that are transmittable from the portable terminal.

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches a page reception section that receives destination information for identifying a return destination of the

input information. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches a page reception section that associates the destination information with package identification information. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches an input information transmission section that selects and combines a plurality of input parameters of a package from the information storage section. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches an input information transmission section that transmits the resulting combination to the return destination identified by the destination information associated with the package.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 6, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

g. Claim 7 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "an input information display section for displaying input parameters stored in the input information storage section; and a selection section for enabling the user to select input information to be transmitted; wherein the input information transmission section transmits the selected input information" as recited in claim 7. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0046 and 0056] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 7; Office Action (1/5/2011), page 8. Appellants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Iida teaches dividing long text data into a plurality of segment data each having a data size displayable on the portable terminal. Further, Iida teaches allowing a user to enter text data in an e-mail up to the limit of the number of characters that are transmittable from the portable terminal.

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches an input information display section for displaying input parameters stored in the input information storage section. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches a selection section for enabling the user to select input information to be transmitted. Neither is

there any language in the cited passages that teaches a selection section for enabling the user to select input information to be transmitted, where the input information transmission section transmits the selected input information.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 7, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

h. Claim 8 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "an online detection section for determining whether the information terminal can communicate with an external apparatus, wherein the input information transmission section transmits the combined input parameters responsive to a determination of whether the information terminal can communicate with the external apparatus" as recited in claim 8. The Examiner cites paragraph [0050] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 7; Office Action (1/5/2011), page 8. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Iida teaches that the control code is used not only to arrange the text data that have been sequentially read out from the respective text input boxes in order of time of input and reconstruct an uninterrupted main text data of the e-mail in the gateway server 7 but also to reedit the text data having been transmitted from the portable terminal 1 to the gateway server 7. [0050].

There is no language in the cited passage that teaches an online detection section for determining whether the information terminal can communicate with an external apparatus. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches an input information transmission section that transmits the combined input parameters responsive to a determination of whether the information terminal can communicate with the external apparatus.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 8, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

i. Claim 9 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "a return information storage section for associating return information from a server which has received the combined input parameters with information for identifying the server and storing the return information; and a return information display section for displaying the return information responsive to an instruction to display the return information" as recited in claim 9. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0046, 0050 and 0056] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 8; Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 8-9. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Iida teaches that when all of the text data entered into the text input boxes are read out and output to the gateway server 7 and all of the text input boxes become empty (step T8), the gateway server 7 arranges the text data that have been sequentially read out from the text input boxes in order of time of input, and outputs a series of all arranged main text data of e-mail to the POP server 8 (step T9). [0046]. Iida further teaches that the POP server 8 performs a transmission of the e-mail as an SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) server. [0046]. Additionally, Iida teaches that the control code is used not only to arrange the text data that have been sequentially read out from the respective text input boxes in order of time of input and reconstruct an uninterrupted main text data of the e-mail in the gateway server 7 but also to reedit the text data having been transmitted from the portable terminal 1 to the gateway server 7. [0050]. Furthermore, Iida teaches that according to the transmitting/receiving method of the text data in the portable terminal, main text data received from a predetermined server are divided into a plurality of segment text data each having a data size displayable on the portable terminal and output to the portable

terminal by a gateway server. [0056].

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches a return information storage section for associating return information from a server which has received the combined input parameters with information for identifying the server and storing the return information. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches a return information display section for displaying the return information responsive to an instruction to display the return information.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 9, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

j. Claim 12 is patentable over Iida in view of Hopson.

Appellants respectfully assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "transmitting a plurality of input pages from a server to an information terminal in response to a request from the information terminal" as recited in claim 12. As understood by Appellants, the Examiner cites paragraph [0046], lines 1-5 of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 4, 9. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Iida teaches that when all of the text data entered into the text input boxes are read out and output to the gateway server 7 and all of the text input boxes become empty (step T8), the gateway server 7 arranges the text data that have been sequentially read out from the text input boxes in order of time of input, and outputs a series of all arranged main text data of e-mail to the POP server 8 (step T9). [0046].

Hence, Iida teaches sending text data of an e-mail entered by the user to gateway server 7.

There is no language in the cited passage of Iida that teaches transmitting a plurality of input pages from a server to an information terminal. Instead, Iida teaches that the POP server 8 outputs the main text data of the designated e-mail (e-

mail selected by the user of the portable terminal out of an e-mail list) in response to the selection made by the user (i.e., the selection of the designated e-mail by the user). See, e.g., paragraph [0035].

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 12, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Appellants further assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "storing, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages" as recited in claim 12. As understood by Appellants, the Examiner cites element 24 of Hopson as teaching the claimed input information storage section and further cites paragraphs [0029, 0031, 0032, 0046, 0049, 0057, 0058 and 0061] of Hopson as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 10. Appellants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Hopson teaches a server 22 that includes an order database 24 that stores data relating to items available for sale, customers, customer orders, delivery addresses, etc.

There is no language in the cited passages that teaches storing in a memory of the information terminal a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages. Instead, Hopson teaches a **server** 22 with an order database 24 for storing data related to an order.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 12, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Appellants further assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "combining the stored input parameters according to package identification information" as recited in claim 12. As understood by Appellants, the Examiner cites paragraphs [0030 and 0035] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim

limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 4 and 9. The Examiner further cites paragraphs [0031, 0032, 0038, 0040, 0046, 0047, 0049, 0057, 0058, 0061] of Hopson as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. *Id.* at pages 4-5 and 10. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Iida teaches that Figure 1 shows an example of a system configuration used in a case where a portable terminal adaptable to Compact HTML (Hyper Text Markup Language) accesses via a gateway server to a POP (Post Office Protocol) server or the like that requires user authentication. [0030]. Iida further teaches that in response to a user's operation, the portable terminal 1 displays a screen of a received e-mail list (not shown) on the display 2. [0035]. Iida further teaches that then, a desirable e-mail is selected from the received e-mail list on the screen. [0035]. Additionally, Iida teaches that in response to the selection, a request for receiving (reading out) the desirable e-mail is output from the portable terminal 1 to the POP server 8 (step S1). [0035].

Hence, Iida teaches that a portable terminal displays a received e-mail list. After the user of the portable terminal selects an e-mail from the e-mail list, a request for receiving (reading out) the selected e-mail is output from the portable terminal to the Post Office Protocol server.

There is no language in the cited passages of Iida that teaches combining the stored input parameters. The Examiner has not specifically pointed to any language in Iida that is directed to storing input parameters. Neither has the Examiner explained how Iida teaches combining such stored input parameters. Neither is there any language in the cited passages of Iida that teaches combining the stored input parameters according to package identification information.

Furthermore, as stated above, Hopson teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents a shopping screen to the customer. Hopson further teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items

for an order, a checkout option is then selected, and the system provides a display of the contents of the shopping cart.

There is no language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches combining the stored input parameters. The Examiner has not specifically pointed to any language in Hopson that is directed to storing input parameters. If the Examiner is asserting that the information provided by the user to order an item/service corresponds to the claimed input parameters, then the Examiner has to show that Hopson stores such input parameters in a memory of the information terminal as required in claim 12. Furthermore, the Examiner must show that Hopson teaches combining such stored input parameters according to package identification information.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 12, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Appellants further assert that Iida and Hopson, taken singly or in combination, do not teach "transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction" as recited in claim 12. As understood by Appellants, the Examiner cites paragraphs [0030 and 0035] of Iida as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (1/5/2011), pages 4 and 9. The Examiner further cites paragraphs [0031, 0032, 0038, 0040, 0046, 0047, 0049, 0057, 0058, 0061] of Hopson as teaching the above-cited claim limitations. *Id.* at pages 4-5 and 10. Appellants respectfully traverse.

As stated above, Iida teaches that a portable terminal displays a received e-mail list. After the user of the portable terminal selects an e-mail from the e-mail list, a request for receiving (reading out) the selected e-mail is output from the portable terminal to the Post Office Protocol server.

There is no language in the cited passages of Iida that teaches transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server. Instead, Iida

teaches transmitting a request by the portable terminal 1 to the POP server 8 to output the main text data of the e-mail designated by the user of the portable terminal. See, e.g., paragraph [0035]. Neither is there any language in the cited passages of Iida that teaches transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction.

Furthermore, as stated above, Hopson teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents a shopping screen to the customer. Hopson further teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option is then selected, and the system provides a display of the contents of the shopping cart.

There is no language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server. Instead, Hopson teaches that the customer of the user computer 22 orders an item/service from a store over the Internet. See, e.g., Abstract. If the Examiner is asserting that the information provided by the user to order an item/service corresponds to the claimed input parameters, then the Examiner has to show that Hopson combines such input parameters according to package identification information as required in claim 12. Furthermore, the Examiner must show that such combined input parameters are transmitted from the information terminal to the server.

Neither is there any language in the cited passages of Hopson that teaches transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction.

Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 12, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. M.P.E.P. §2143.

2. Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson to include the missing claim limitations of claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14 is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed. M.P.E.P. §2143. The Examiner must provide articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. M.P.E.P. §2143.

The Examiner admits that Iida does not teach "an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 10, 11, 13 and 14. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 4. Additionally, the Examiner admits that Iida does not teach "an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction" as recited in claim 11. *Id.* Furthermore, the Examiner admits that Iida does not teach that "the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 10, 11, 13 and 14. *Id.* The Examiner asserts that Hopson teaches the above-cited claim limitations. *Id.* at pages 4 and 5. The Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson to include the above-cited claim limitations is "for better efficiency." *Id.* at page 5. The Examiner's reasoning is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1, 3-11 and 13-14.

The Examiner relies upon paragraphs [0002 and 0012] of Iida and paragraphs [0057 and 0061] of Hopson as support for the Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson to include the above-cited missing claim limitations of claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 5.

Iida teaches that the invention of Iida relates to a transmission/reception method of text data in a portable terminal capable of transmitting/receiving such text data without any limitation irrespective of a total number of characters contained in

the text data that are transmitted/received in the portable terminal via an information communication network constituted by either a public line network or a private line network such as the Internet. [0002]. Iida further teaches that a text data receiving method in a portable terminal which receives text data supplied from a predetermined server provided on an information communication network via a gateway server provided on the information communication network, comprises the steps of: storing all of the text data supplied from the predetermined server into the gateway server; dividing the all of the text data stored in the gateway server into a plurality of page-segment text data by the number of characters that is allowed to be displayed on the portable terminal; and outputting the text data to the portable terminal in the form of the page-segment text data having the number of characters so divided. [0012].

Hence, Iida teaches a portable terminal capable of transmitting/receiving text data without any limitation irrespective of the total number of characters contained in the text data that are transmitted/received in the portal terminal.

There is no language in Iida (and in particular paragraphs [0002 and 0012]) that makes any suggestion to: (1) have an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages; (2) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction; and (3) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmitting the combined input parameters to the server (missing claim limitations) in order to improve the efficiency of the system of Iida (Examiner's reasoning). The Examiner has to provide some rational connection between the passages in Iida that are the source of the Examiner's reasoning and the missing claim limitations. The Examiner's source of reasoning (paragraphs [0002 and 0012] of Iida) does not provide reasons as to why one skilled in the art would modify Iida to include the missing claim limitations of claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claims 1, 3-11 and

13-14. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Furthermore, Hopson teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents, at 230 of FIG. 3B, a shopping screen to the customer. [0057]. Furthermore, Hopson teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option, at 242, is then selected; and the system provides a display, at 246, of the contents of the shopping cart. [0058]. In addition, Hopson teaches that the submitted order is stored in the order database 24 of the server 22. [0061].

Hence, Hopson teaches the server presenting a shopping screen to the customer. Additionally, Hopson teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option is selected.

There is no language in Hopson (and in particular paragraphs [0057 and 0061]) that makes any suggestion for the information terminal to: (1) have an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages; (2) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction; and (3) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmitting the combined input parameters to the server (missing claim limitations) in order to improve the efficiency of the system of Iida (Examiner's reasoning). The Examiner has to provide some rational connection between the passages in Hopson that are the source of the Examiner's reasoning and the missing claim limitations. The Examiner's source of reasoning (paragraphs [0057 and 0061] of Hopson) does not provide reasons as to why one skilled in the art would modify Iida to include the missing claim limitations of claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claims 1, 3-11 and 13-14. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Further, as stated above, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of

obviousness, the Examiner must provide articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning. M.P.E.P. §2143. That is, in order to sustain the rejection of claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14 for obviousness, the Examiner has to provide some rational connection between the Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson and the missing claim limitations.

Iida addresses the problem of inputting or transmitting an e-mail exceeding the limitation in the predetermined number of characters. [0004-0010]. The Examiner's rationale ("for better efficiency") does not provide any reasons as to why one skilled in the art would modify Iida (which teaches inputting or transmitting an e-mail exceeding the limitation in the predetermined number of characters) to: (1) have an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages; (2) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction; and (3) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmitting the combined input parameters to the server (missing claim limitations).

Why would the reason to modify Iida (whose purpose is to develop a method for inputting or transmitting an e-mail exceeding the limitation in the predetermined number of characters) to: (1) have an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages; (2) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction; and (3) have an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmitting the combined input parameters to the server (missing claim limitations) be to improve efficiency? There are many ways of improving efficiency. Why in particular though would one skilled in the art modify Iida to include these missing claim limitations in order to improve efficiency?

Furthermore, what is the rational connection between having an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages (missing claim limitation) and improving efficiency (Examiner's reasoning)? Additionally, what is the rational connection between having an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction (missing claim limitation) and improving efficiency (Examiner's reasoning)? In addition, what is the rational connection between having an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmitting the combined input parameters to the server (missing claim limitation) and improving efficiency (Examiner's reasoning)?

Hence, the Examiner's rationale does not provide reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would modify Iida to include the above-cited missing claim limitations of claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claims 1, 3-11 and 13-14. M.P.E.P. §2143.

3. Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson to include the missing claim limitations of clam 12 is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As stated above, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed. M.P.E.P. §2143. The Examiner must provide articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. M.P.E.P. §2143.

The Examiner admits that Iida does not teach "storing, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of

the input pages" as recited in claim 12. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 8; Office Action (1/5/2011), page 9. The Examiner further admits that Iida does not teach "combining the stored input parameters according to package identification information" as recited in claim 12. Office Action (6/25/2010), page 9; Office Action (1/5/2011), page 9. Additionally, the Examiner admits that Iida does not teach "transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction" as recited in claim 12. *Id.* The Examiner asserts that Hopson teaches the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 10. The Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson to include the above-cited claim limitations is "for better efficiency." Office Action (1/5/2011), page 11. The Examiner's reasoning is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 12.

The Examiner relies upon paragraphs [0002 and 0012] of Iida and paragraphs [0057 and 0061] of Hopson as support for the Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson to include the above-cited missing claim limitations of claim 12. Office Action (1/5/2011), page 11.

Iida teaches that the invention of Iida relates to a transmission/reception method of text data in a portable terminal capable of transmitting/receiving such text data without any limitation irrespective of a total number of characters contained in the text data that are transmitted/received in the portable terminal via an information communication network constituted by either a public line network or a private line network such as the Internet. [0002]. Iida further teaches that a text data receiving method in a portable terminal which receives text data supplied from a predetermined server provided on an information communication network via a gateway server provided on the information communication network, comprises the steps of: storing all of the text data supplied from the predetermined server into the gateway server; dividing the all of the text data stored in the gateway server into a plurality of page-segment text data by the number of characters that is allowed to be displayed on the portable terminal; and outputting the text data to the portable terminal in the form of

the page-segment text data having the number of characters so divided. [0012].

Hence, Iida teaches a portable terminal capable of transmitting/receiving text data without any limitation irrespective of the total number of characters contained in the text data that are transmitted/received in the portal terminal.

There is no language in Iida (and in particular paragraphs [0002 and 0012]) that makes any suggestion to: (1) store, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages; (2) combine the stored input parameters according to package identification information; and (3) transmit the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction (missing claim limitations) in order to improve the efficiency of the system of Iida (Examiner's reasoning). The Examiner has to provide some rational connection between the passages in Iida that are the source of the Examiner's reasoning and the missing claim limitations. The Examiner's source of reasoning (paragraphs [0002 and 0012] of Iida) does not provide reasons as to why one skilled in the art would modify Iida to include the missing claim limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claim 12. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Furthermore, Hopson teaches that upon the customer accepting the selected delivery time, the server 22 presents, at 230 of FIG. 3B, a shopping screen to the customer. [0057]. Furthermore, Hopson teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option, at 242, is then selected; and the system provides a display, at 246, of the contents of the shopping cart. [0058]. In addition, Hopson teaches that the submitted order is stored in the order database 24 of the server 22. [0061].

Hence, Hopson teaches the server presenting a shopping screen to the customer. Additionally, Hopson teaches that after the customer has selected all of the items for an order, a checkout option is selected.

There is no language in Hopson (and in particular paragraphs [0057 and

0061]) that makes any suggestion to: (1) store, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages; (2) combine the stored input parameters according to package identification information; and (3) transmit the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction (missing claim limitations) in order to improve the efficiency of the system of Iida (Examiner's reasoning). The Examiner has to provide some rational connection between the passages in Hopson that are the source of the Examiner's reasoning and the missing claim limitations. The Examiner's source of reasoning (paragraphs [0057 and 0061] of Hopson) does not provide reasons as to why one skilled in the art would modify Iida to include the missing claim limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claim 12. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Further, as stated above, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must provide articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning. M.P.E.P. §2143. That is, in order to sustain the rejection of claim 12 for obviousness, the Examiner has to provide some rational connection between the Examiner's reasoning for modifying Iida with Hopson and the missing claim limitations.

Iida addresses the problem of inputting or transmitting an e-mail exceeding the limitation in the predetermined number of characters. [0004-0010]. The Examiner's rationale ("for better efficiency") does not provide any reasons as to why one skilled in the art would modify Iida (which teaches inputting or transmitting an e-mail exceeding the limitation in the predetermined number of characters) to: (1) store, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages; (2) combine the stored input parameters according to package identification information; and (3) transmit the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction (missing claim limitations).

Why would the reason to modify Iida (whose purpose is to develop a method for inputting or transmitting an e-mail exceeding the limitation in the predetermined number of characters) to: (1) store, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages; (2) combine the stored input parameters according to package identification information; and (3) transmit the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction (missing claim limitations) be to improve efficiency? There are many ways of improving efficiency. Why in particular though would one skilled in the art modify Iida to include these missing claim limitations in order to improve efficiency?

Furthermore, what is the rational connection between storing, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages (missing claim limitation) and improving efficiency (Examiner's reasoning)? Additionally, what is the rational connection between combining the stored input parameters according to package identification information (missing claim limitation) and improving efficiency (Examiner's reasoning)? Furthermore, what is the rational connection between transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction (missing claim limitation) and improving efficiency (Examiner's reasoning)?

Hence, the Examiner's rationale does not provide reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would modify Iida to include the above-cited missing claim limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claim 12. M.P.E.P. §2143.

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons noted above, the rejections of claims 1 and 3-14 are in error. Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1 and 3-14.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD P.C.

Attorneys for Appellants

By: _____

Robert A. Voigt, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,159

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201
(512) 370-2832

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. An information terminal which displays input pages downloaded from a server via a network, and which transmits, using the network, information entered into the input pages by a user, said information terminal comprising:

a page display section for displaying a plurality of input pages using a browser executed by the information terminal;

an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered by a user into more than one of the input pages;

an input information transmission section for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction; and

a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, wherein the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server.

3. The information terminal according to claim 1,

wherein the input information storage section associates input identification information for identifying input information of a package with the input parameters, and

wherein the input information transmission section selects and combines input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and which are associated with the same input identification information from among the input parameters stored in the input information storage section, and transmits the resulting combination as the input information.

4. The information terminal according to claim 1, wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters and transmits the combination after all of the input parameters of a package have been stored in the input information storage section.

5. The information terminal according to claim 1, further comprising a page storage section for storing the input pages and associating the plurality of input pages with package identification information;

wherein the page reception section receives the input pages and associates the input pages with information for identifying a display order; and further

wherein the page display section displays a selected input page stored in the page storage section, and then, responsive to receiving an indication that entry of input into the selected input page is complete, displays the input page that is next according to the display order.

6. The information terminal according to claim 1,

wherein the page reception section receives destination information for identifying a return destination of the input information, associates the destination information with package identification information; and

the input information transmission section selects and combines a plurality of input parameters of a package from the information storage section, and transmits the resulting combination to the return destination identified by the destination information associated with the package.

7. The information terminal according to claim 1, further comprising:

an input information display section for displaying input parameters stored in the input information storage section; and

a selection section for enabling the user to select input information to be transmitted;

wherein the input information transmission section transmits the selected input information.

8. The information terminal according to claim 1, further comprising an online detection section for determining whether the information terminal can communicate with an external apparatus, wherein the input information transmission section

transmits the combined input parameters responsive to a determination of whether the information terminal can communicate with the external apparatus.

9. The information terminal according to claim 1, further comprising:

a return information storage section for associating return information from a server which has received the combined input parameters with information for identifying the server and storing the return information; and

a return information display section for displaying the return information responsive to an instruction to display the return information.

10. A transmission-reception proxy apparatus for displaying input pages downloaded from a server to an information terminal via a network, and for transmitting information entered into the input pages by a user, the proxy apparatus comprising:

a page display section for displaying a plurality of input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal;

an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages;

an input information transmission section for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction to transmit the plurality of input parameters; and

a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, wherein the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server.

11. A communication system comprising a server for storing a plurality of input pages and an information terminal for accepting a user's entries into the input pages, wherein the server comprises a page transmission section for transmitting the input

pages in response to an instruction from the information terminal, said information terminal comprising:

a page reception section for transmitting the instruction from the information terminal and for receiving the input pages;

a page display section for displaying the input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal;

an input information storage section for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages;

an input information transmission section for combining the input parameters and transmitting combined input parameters in response to an instruction; and

a page reception section for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, wherein the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server.

12. A method of communication between a server which stores a plurality of input pages and an information terminal which accepts a user's input entered using more than one of the input pages, comprising the steps of:

transmitting a plurality of input pages from a server to an information terminal in response to a request from the information terminal;

receiving the input pages by the information terminal;

displaying the input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal;

storing, in a memory of the information terminal, a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages;

combining the stored input parameters according to package identification information; and

transmitting the combined input parameters from the information terminal to the server in response to an instruction.

13. A program product enabling a computer to function as an information terminal which displays input pages downloaded from a server via a network and transmits information entered into the input pages by a user, said program product providing modules of computer usable program code tangibly embodied in a computer usable storage medium, said modules comprising:

a page display module for displaying input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal;

an input information storage module for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages;

an input information transmission module for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to receiving an instruction; and

a page reception module for receiving the input pages and for associating the input pages with package identification information, wherein the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server.

14. A computer usable recording medium that tangibly embodies modules of computer usable program instructions enabling a computer to function as an information terminal for displaying input pages downloaded from a server via a network and for transmitting, using the network, information entered by a user into more than one of the input pages, said recording medium comprising:

a page display module for displaying a plurality of input pages using a browser executed on the information terminal;

an input information storage module for storing a plurality of input parameters entered using more than one of the input pages;

an input information transmission module for transmitting the plurality of input parameters in response to an instruction to transmit the plurality of input parameters; and

a page reception module for receiving the input pages and for associating the

input pages with package identification information, wherein the input pages enable a user to enter the plurality of input parameters, and further wherein the input information transmission section combines the input parameters entered into the input pages of a package and transmits the combined input parameters to the server.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence was submitted pursuant to §§1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of 37 C.F.R. or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner and relied upon by Appellants in the Appeal.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings to the current proceeding.

AUSTIN_1\625354v1
7036-P342US 03/09/2011